

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

To: JOHN K. HARROP DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP 1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 300 SOUTH WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004		Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 19 JUN 2001	
Applicant's or agent's file reference 5260.01		REPLY DUE within TWO months from the above date of mailing	
International application No. PCT/US00/01708	International filing date (day/month/year) 27 JANUARY 2000	Priority date (day/month/year) 27 JANUARY 1999	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): HO4N 7/173 and US Cl.: 725/87			
Applicant DISCOVERY COMMUNICATIONS INC.			

1. This written opinion is the <u>first</u> (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.	
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:	
I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Basis of the opinion
II <input type="checkbox"/>	Priority
III <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
IV <input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of unity of invention
V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
VI <input type="checkbox"/>	Certain documents cited
VII <input type="checkbox"/>	Certain defects in the international application
VIII <input type="checkbox"/>	Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.	
When?	See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).
How?	By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.
Also	For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 <i>bis</i> . For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.
If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.	
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: <u>27 MAY 2001</u>	

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Box PCT Washington, D.C. 20231 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer CHRISTOPHER GRANT <i>R. Eugenio Zozan</i> Telephone No. (703) 305-4555
---	--

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US00/01708

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application: *

☒ the international application as originally filed

☒ the description:

pages 1-41, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

☒ the claims:

pages 42-52, as originally filed
pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

☒ the drawings:

pages 1-46, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

☒ the sequence listing part of the description:

pages NONE, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).

☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).

☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

☐ contained in the international application in printed form.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.

☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.

☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☒ the description, pages NONE

☒ the claims, Nos. NONE

☒ the drawings, sheets/fig. NONE

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed".

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US00/01708

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-106</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-106</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-106</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	NO

2. citations and explanations

Claims 1-106 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Hendricks et al. (Hendricks) (WO 95 15649).

Considering claim 1, Hendricks discloses system for transmitting and receiving text and displaying an indication of the text, wherein the text is transmitted in an electronic signal comprising:

- a) transmitter (208);
- b) connector (212);
- c) display (266).

Claims 2-17 are met by Hendricks on pages 1-38 and the drawings.

Considering claims 18, 32, 49, 63, 89 and 98, Hendricks discloses a method for distributing text material in textual data form using an electronic signal and transmission medium, comprising:

- a) coding (204) textual data onto an electronic signal;
- b) transmitting (208) the electronic signal;
- c) receiving (212) and displaying (266) the electronic signal including library menus (pages 22-25);
- d) searching (pages 26-28) the textual data.

Claims 19-31, 33-48, 50-62, 90-97 and 99-106 are met by Hendricks on pages 1-38 and the drawings.

Considering claim 64, Hendricks discloses an electronic book catalog system for use with an electronic book unit (266), comprising:

- a) connector (212);
- b) memory (600) (figures 6 or 8);
- c) processor (628) (figures 14d and 15).

Claims 65-88 are met by Hendricks on pages 1-38 and the drawings.

(Continued on Supplemental Sheet.)

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US00/01708

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: Boxes I - VIII

Sheet 10

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.

V. 2. REASONED STATEMENTS - CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS (Continued):

-----NEW CITATION-----

WO 95 15649 A (HENDRICKS et al.) 08 June 1995, whole document